

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. pre-grant publication 2001/0044805 by Multer in view of U.S. pre-grant publication number 2002/0116404 by Cha et al. The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 14-8 and 20 was based on the Examiner's determination that each and every limitation, of each and every claim, can be found in the combination of *Multer* and *Cha*.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, the independent claims, claims 1 and 12, have been further amended, as set forth herein. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, for instance, with respect to the description of the change list lock, e.g., on page 10, lines 1-3, page 11, lines 2-5, and page 4, line 27-page 5, line 3.

Specifically, with respect to claim 1, the first change-list lock is now stated to be configured to lock the first change list to prohibit changes to the first change list upon commencement of the synchronization process. A selected time period during which a data base is changes is stated to be defined by locking of the first change list by the first change list lock.

The applicants assert that Multer fails to disclose a change-list lock, or analogous operation, as now-recited. Specific references made to paragraph 202 of Multer upon which the Examiner places reliance. While the cited section references utilization of locking semantics to control read and write access against data stored in a network, there is no disclosure of a definition of a selected time period as now recited in the independent claims.

Additionally, the applicants again assert that reliance upon Cha is misplaced. Cha appears to be directed towards synchronization of different versions of the same data base and not synchronization of a network-copy database and a mobile-copy database as set forth in the present invention and defined in the claims.

As the remaining ones of the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims, the dependent claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com